Exhibit A

	N3GQdoe1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED
3	STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS Plaintiffs
4	v. 22 Civ. 10904 (JSR) JPMORGAN CHASE BANK N.A.
5	Defendants x
6	JANE DOE 1, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly
7	situated, Plaintiffs
8	v. 22 Civ. 10019 (JSR) JPMORGAN CHASE & CO., ORAL ARGUMENT
9	Defendants
10	x
11	New York, N.Y.
12	March 16, 2023
13	4:30 p.m.
14	Before:
15	HON. JED S. RAKOFF
16	District Judge
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	(Continued on next page)
25	

N3GQdoe1

question of whether we need to, for example, previously all discovery was to be completed by April 24 and class certification reports were due on March 1, and the motions on class certification were to be made and responded to in various dates in March and April. We were going to have an oral argument on May 12, and then there was argument leading up to a final pretrial conference on June 12. I am happy to move any and all of those dates, but not the trial date.

So does anyone want to make any suggestions in that regard?

MS. SINGER: Linda Singer, your Honor. I'm happy to open the bidding on this one.

So the U.S. Virgin Islands and the Doe plaintiffs had previously been in touch with JPMorgan which had asked us about extending the schedule. What we had proposed to them was moving the deadline for plaintiffs' expert reports till the end of April, which I think takes some of the pressure off some of the discovery issues because depositions can then move back. So that would be one suggestion. Obviously, we can't speak to the class certification issues

THE COURT: Okay, anyone disagree with that?

MR. BUTTS: Your Honor, John Butts for JPMorgan. We are happy to proceed on any schedule. The schedule that -- I know you're asking this, with Mr. Staley's third-party complaint aside, our interest is doing everything in one

N3GQdoe1

plays out in terms of timing, but I will for the moment stick to the 60 days.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, may I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. EDWARDS: Bradley Edwards on behalf of Jane Does.

Maintaining the trial date is extraordinarily important to our clients, and so we would move -- if it is the third-party complaint that is going to disrupt that, we would move at this time to sever the third-party complaint and just proceed on the way that -- on the track that we're all scheduled to be on.

MS. SINGER: Your Honor, if I may add to that for the U.S. Virgin Islands. Obviously, the Court has discretion under Rule 14(a)(4) to sever and stay a third-party complaint in this case.

THE COURT: Last I heard, I have that discretion even without the rule.

MS. SINGER: Understood. In the same vein of service and all things, understood. In this case, we do believe it's in the interest of judicial economy, particularly because most of the claims against Mr. Staley are contingent claims, and this is an instance with proceeding with the case-in-chief allowing the plaintiffs to proceed to trial.

And then, you know, if a secondary trial is needed on

N3GQdoe1

that we move the Deutsche Bank case to September 5.

So I think those are the only three realistic options.

So I heard -- and I think it's not without some force -- plaintiff's counsel's feeling desire to move this case forward rapidly. It's a case of public importance. It's a case that counsel have worked hard to meet the schedule of the Court. On the other hand, I am not really clear why a modest delay, essentially in the case of the JPMorgan case, a month and a half, is really so prejudicial.

But let me hear anything further that plaintiff's counsel wanted to say on that.

MR. VILLACASTIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Andrew Villacastin from Boies Schiller Flexner.

Jane Doe's preference is to keep the trial dates. I think your inclination in the beginning of the hearing where you noted that there was some play in the joints, you had the ability — we have a separate trial on June 20 and a two-month delay before the beginning of trial. We have ten unripe applications. We don't know how Mr. Staley's entering into the case necessarily will affect the schedule, and I think we should hear what he intends to do before we necessarily move it.

You know, there was a mention of severance as well. I think, you know, we can consider what the parties' intentions are. The parties have not yet conferred on this, as I think